BEFORE THE ARIZONA MEDICAL BOARD

In the Matter of

VEERASHEKARAPPA MOODABAGILU, M.D.

Holder of License No. 26014
For the Practice of Allopathic Medicine
In the State of Arizona

Case No. MD-06-0346C

CONSENT AGREEMENT FOR LETTER OF REPRIMAND

CONSENT AGREEMENT

By mutual agreement and understanding, between the Arizona Medical Board ("Board") and Veerashekarappa Moodabagilu, M.D. ("Respondent"), the parties agreed to the following disposition of this matter.

- 1. Respondent has read and understands this Consent Agreement and the stipulated Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Order ("Consent Agreement"). Respondent acknowledges that he has the right to consult with legal counsel regarding this matter.
- 2. By entering into this Consent Agreement, Respondent voluntarily relinquishes any rights to a hearing or judicial review in state or federal court on the matters alleged, or to challenge this Consent Agreement in its entirety as issued by the Board, and waives any other cause of action related thereto or arising from said Consent Agreement.
- 3. This Consent Agreement is not effective until approved by the Board and signed by its Executive Director.
- 4. The Board may adopt this Consent Agreement of any part thereof. This Consent Agreement, or any part thereof, may be considered in any future disciplinary action against Respondent.
- 5. This Consent Agreement does not constitute a dismissal or resolution of other matters currently pending before the Board, if any, and does not constitute any waiver,

express or implied, of the Board's statutory authority or jurisdiction regarding any other pending or future investigation, action or proceeding. The acceptance of this Consent Agreement does not preclude any other agency, subdivision or officer of this State from instituting other civil or criminal proceedings with respect to the conduct that is the subject of this Consent Agreement.

- 6. All admissions made by Respondent are solely for final disposition of this matter and any subsequent related administrative proceedings or civil litigation involving the Board and Respondent. Therefore, said admissions by Respondent are not intended or made for any other use, such as in the context of another state or federal government regulatory agency proceeding, civil or criminal court proceeding, in the State of Arizona or any other state or federal court.
- 7. Upon signing this agreement, and returning this document (or a copy thereof) to the Board's Executive Director, Respondent may not revoke the acceptance of the Consent Agreement. Respondent may not make any modifications to the document. Any modifications to this original document are ineffective and void unless mutually approved by the parties.
- 8. If the Board does not adopt this Consent Agreement, Respondent will not assert as a defense that the Board's consideration of this Consent Agreement constitutes bias, prejudice, prejudgment or other similar defense.
- 9. This Consent Agreement, once approved and signed, is a public record that will be publicly disseminated as a formal action of the Board and will be reported to the National Practitioner Data Bank and to the Arizona Medical Board's website.
- 10. If any part of the Consent Agreement is later declared void or otherwise unenforceable, the remainder of the Consent Agreement in its entirety shall remain in force and effect.

04/10

11. Any violation of this Consent Agreement constitutes unprofessional conduct and may result in disciplinary action. A.R.S. § § 32-1401(27)(r) ("[v]iolating a formal order, probation, consent agreement or stipulation issued or entered into by the board or its executive director under this chapter") and 32-1451.

SHEKARAPPA MOODABAGILU, M.D.

DATED: 15th May 07

3

2

5

4

6 7

8 9

10 11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24 25

FINDINGS OF FACT

- The Board is the duly constituted authority for the regulation and control of 1. the practice of allopathic medicine in the State of Arizona.
- Respondent is the holder of license number 26014 for the practice of 2. allopathic medicine in the State of Arizona.
- The Board initiated case number MD-06-0346C after receiving notification of 3. a malpractice settlement involving Respondent's care and treatment of a fifty-five year-old female patient ("RP").
- On April 30, 2002 RP presented to the rheumatologist ("Rheumatologist") for a disability claim evaluation and complaining of lower back and neck pain. RP stated she has a history chronic lower back pain. On May 3, 2002 RP presented to another physician ("Physician #1) for evaluation and again complained of lower back pain and numbness in her toes and leg. On May 4, 2002 RP presented to Respondent for an evaluation and he noted she had a temperature of 99 and complained of back pain. Respondent believed RP had acute bronchitis, but the chest X-ray was reported as normal. Respondent evaluated RP again on May 5, 2002 and her blood cultures were positive for Streptococcus B. On May 6, 2002 Physician #1 evaluated RP and noted she still complained of back pain and lumbar spine tenderness.
- On May 10, 2002 RP presented to another physician ("Physician #2") to 5. complete her disability forms. Physician #2 noted she complained of back pain. Physician #2 evaluated RP again on May 14, 2002 and noted she complained of back pain and numbness on her face and right hand.
- On May 18, 2002 RP presented to the hospital and was examined by the 6. emergency room physician ("Physician #3"). Physician #3 admitted RP to the hospital with severe left posterior thoracic pain worse with inspiration. Physician #3 noted RP had

normal heart, lung and neurologic examinations, but he was concerned RP may have a pulmonary embolus because she had limited activity. On May 19, 2002 Physician #3 noted RP had severe mid back pain. The nurse noted RP had back pain with radiation to the calf. Physician #3 ordered a bone scan of RP's lumbar spine demonstrating an increase uptake at L5. Physician #3 transferred RP to a care center.

- Respondent resumed care of RP on May 23, 2002 and noted her prior history and that she had no neurologic deficits. On May 25, 2002 the care center nurse noted RP could not void and she had to be straight catheterized for 600cc at 2:45 p.m. At 7:10 p.m. the nurse noted RP complained of severe back pain, numbness of her lower body and no strength in her legs. The nurse called Respondent and he stated he was aware of the problem and did not present to examine RP until May 29, 2002. On May 26, 2002 the nurse noted RP was straight catheterized for 1000cc and reported numbness in RP's lower extremities and an inability to move her toes. The nurse contacted Respondent and he advised the nurse that he would ask another physician to evaluate RP. On May 27, 2002 the nurse noted RP could not feel her lower extremities.
- 8. On May 29, 2002 Respondent performed a neurologic examination on RP and noted she complained of weakness, distention of the bladder, inability to sit up and decreased sensation distally from T10. Respondent arranged a transfer to another hospital and a neurosurgery consultation for RP, but her transfer was delayed because no beds were available.
- 9. On May 31, 2002 RP was transferred and admitted to the hospital unable to move her lower extremities. The neurosurgeon ("Neurosurgeon") ordered a magnetic resonance imaging scan demonstrating diskitis, osteomyelitis and an epidural abscess. Neurosurgeon performed a laminectomy and thecal sac decompression T6 T8. On June

6

4

11

13

15 16

17

18

19

2021

22

2324

25

- 4, 2002 Neurosurgeon transferred RP to an acute spinal rehabilitation neurologically unchanged.
- 10. In a patient with a prior history of infection who is complaining of a changing neurologic condition with loss of sensation, motor strength or loss of bowel and/or bladder function, the standard of care requires a physician to perform a thorough neurologic examination and order the appropriate diagnostic studies.
- 11. Respondent deviated from the standard of care because he did not perform a thorough neurologic examination until May 29, 2002 and he did not order diagnostic studies.
- 12. RP developed permanent paraplegia from an epidural abscess that was undiscovered until her transfer on May 31, 2002.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

- 1. The Board possesses jurisdiction over the subject matter hereof and over Respondent.
- 2. The conduct and circumstances described above constitute unprofessional conduct pursuant to A.R.S. § 32-1401 (27)(II) ("[c]onduct that the board determines is gross negligence, repeated negligence or negligence resulting in harm to or the death of a patient").

ORDER

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT:

- 1. Respondent is issued a Letter of Reprimand for failure to address of the patient's neurological deficits.
 - 2. This Order is the final disposition of case number MD-06-0346C.

DATED AND EFFECTIVE this

day of

2008.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

6022617821



ARIZONA MEDICAL BOARD

TIMOTHY C.MILLER. J.D. **Executive Director**

ORIGINAL of the foregoing filed this day of May, 2000 with:

Arizona Medical Board 9545 E. Doubletree Ranch Road Scottsdale, AZ 85258

EXECUTED COPY of the foregoing mailed

Veerashekarappa Moodabagilu, M.D. Address of Record

Investigational Review